

THE RIBOT CABINET FALLS!

ALL ITS MEMBERS HAND THEIR RESIGNATIONS TO PRESIDENT CARNOT.

THE MINISTRY BEATEN BY FIVE MAJORITY ON A QUESTION OF FINANCE, BUT TO REMAIN IN POWER TEMPORARILY—M. DEVELLE SPOKE OF FOR PREMIER.

Paris, March 30.—Another crisis has arrived, and the Ministers have resigned. The crisis arose, not from the Panama scandal, but through the submission to the Chamber by Mr. Lockroy of the report of the Budget Committee on the budget as it was returned to the Chamber from the Senate. Mr. Lockroy announced that the Budget Committee had resolved to send the budget back to the Senate in the form in which it had originally passed the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate, he added, had suppressed in the budget all the reforms passed by the Chamber. It was impossible to permit such an infringement of constitutional prerogatives in the matter of finance.

M. Tirard, Minister of Finance, remarked that the Chamber had never before been asked to return the budget en bloc to the Senate.

M. Lockroy said that the Chamber would discuss the clauses on which it differed from the Senate.

M. Tirard denied a statement that the Senate had set its face against reforms. The Government, he added, would endeavor to carry out the views of the Chamber. If the Senate persisted in opposing the budget proposals, the Government would introduce separate bills taxing deficits on the Bourse and reforming the liquor laws. In the mean time the Ministry must insist upon the necessity for the immediate passage of the budget.

The Chamber then, proceeding to discuss the clauses, rejected the Senate's amendments, including the bill amending the liquor laws. M. Tirard declared that those must be separated from the budget, as the Senate had proposed; otherwise, he said, the Government would be obliged to ask for a vote on account. M. Ribot supported M. Tirard, and urged the Chamber to agree with the Senate.

On the division the Chamber decided, by a vote of 247 to 242, to retain the liquor law amendment bill as part of the budget. When the vote of the Chamber was announced Premier Ribot adjourned the session until 9 o'clock, in order that he and his fellow Ministers might have time to consider their position, and decide whether they should regard the vote of the Chamber as a sign of want of confidence in the Ministry.

After a long consultation in a committee room the Ministers proceeded to the Elysee and tendered their resignations to President Carnot. The President had a long interview with the members of the Cabinet, and urged them to reconsider their determination. His arguments were in vain, however, and the Ministers insisted that their resignations must be accepted.

At 9:15 the Deputies reassembled. All the outward signs of a Cabinet crisis were apparent in the crowded galleries and among the animated groups on the floor of the Chamber. When M. Casimir-Perier took the chair all the Ministerial places were vacant, but a moment later M. Tirard, Minister of Finance, entered alone. He announced in a few words that the Cabinet had resigned, but had been charged by President Carnot to carry on the affairs of State for a short period. He would therefore ask the Chamber for a vote on account, to cover the next two months. The Chamber referred this request to the Budget Committee, and then took a recess.

During the recess of twenty-five minutes the Deputies remained in the corridors and lobbies and eagerly discussed the situation. It was evident that an almost undivided sentiment prevailed against fettering the Chamber's liberty of action by granting M. Tirard's request.

At 10 o'clock, the hour set for reassembling, not a chair in the whole House was vacant. The visitors' galleries were crowded, and hundreds who could not gain admittance were waiting at the entrance to get the earliest possible view of the proceedings. The disorder, which the President had not been able to quiet, was hushed the moment M. Lockroy stepped to the tribune to announce the decision of the Budget Committee. In a few words he stated that the committee felt it to be inexpedient to grant the request made by M. Tirard for two months' supplies, but would recommend a vote covering one month from the present time. Shouts of approval greeted this statement. The brief discussion which followed was one-sided, as the difference of opinion in the Chamber practically concerned only the question whether supplies should be voted for one month or not at all.

Eventually the report of the committee was adopted by a vote of 304 to 5, and the Chamber adjourned until Tuesday.

It is rumored that M. Develle, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Ribot Cabinet, will be asked by President Carnot to form a Ministry.

The immediate cause of the crisis was a division of opinion between Senators and Deputies as to the respective prerogatives of the two Chambers in matters of financial legislation. The liquor law amendment bill was originally a part of the budget, and was sent as such by the Deputies to the Senators. The Senators decided that the bill ought to be separated from the budget, and were supported in this by the Government. The decision was unpopular to the Deputies, as was shown yesterday by the Budget Committee's resolution, passed despite the earnest protests of Premier Ribot and Finance Minister Tirard, that the Deputies assert their rights in financial matters and return the budget to the Senate without considering the amendments of the Senate thereto.

The Ministry that has resigned had held office for only eleven weeks. Upon the overthrow of the Loubet Cabinet several attempts were made to form a new Ministry, but they were unsuccessful until M. Ribot, who was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Loubet Cabinet, was selected for the task. On January 10 it was announced that M. Ribot had formed a Ministry, made up as follows: M. Ribot, Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior; M. Develle, Minister of Foreign Affairs; M. Tirard, Minister of Finance; M. Bourgeois, Minister of Justice; General Loizillon, Minister of War; Admiral Rouvier, Minister of Marine and the Colonies; M. Dupuy, Minister of Public Instruction; M. Viger, Minister of Agriculture; M. Siegfried, Minister of Commerce; M. Viette, Minister of Public Works.

Ever since this Ministry came into power the opponents of the Government have sought an opportunity to overthrow them. The Panama scandal, it was thought, would afford the opportunity, but though more than once a week attacks were made, none proved successful, the Chamber each time voting confirmation in the Government and discomfiting their enemies. The adverse majority of five votes cast by the Chamber to-day on the liquor amendment was a surprise to the Government, and to regard the deliberation the Ministers decided to regard the vote as a vote of want of confidence, and their resignations followed.

Among certain of the political groups there are lacking those who charge that the downfall of the Government was due not so much to the decision of the Chamber to retain the liquor law amendment, as to the Government's refusal to accept the Senate's amendments. The Chamber's refusal to accept the Senate's amendments, it is claimed, was a violation of the Government's promise, and that the Government was bound to make when he was in custody would prove fatal to the Ministry.

case, to avoid everything which would compromise M. Clemenceau.

The resignation of the French Cabinet is one more instance that the Panama scandal has brought France to the position of a sick man who restlessly changes his position in the belief that he may thus alleviate his sufferings and become comfortable. The overthrown Ministry was not yet three months old, and the real cause of its fall cannot be found in the secondary question of an amendment to the liquor bill. This must have served only as a pretext, inasmuch as a favorable or unfavorable vote upon that bill could exercise but a small influence in regard to the general budget.

The Chamber had two grievances of a more serious character against the Cabinet. In the first place, it may have been displeased because the Government had sent before the Senate Court some Deputies who were declared by the jury to be innocent of the bribery charges brought against them and strongly supported by the Public Prosecutor, who is in fact only the mouthpiece and representative of the Minister of Justice. That Minister, M. Bourgeois, had resigned temporarily, in order to defend himself in Court, against the charges launched at him. But his own apology did not in convincing public opinion that he was not more or less responsible for the illegal conduct of subordinates who attempted to blackmail Mme. Cottu. The reinstatement of M. Bourgeois in the Ministry of Justice may have been considered by the Chamber as a defiance to the general sentiment of the country.

Moreover, the decision for a new Chamber will be held in September, and the Deputies, many of whom have already demanded for a dissolution in advance of the constitutional term for closing the present Legislature, were afraid that the Ribot Cabinet was not sufficiently energetic properly to conduct an electoral campaign. In the face of the dissatisfaction caused by the Panama scandal, and of the reorganization of the socialist forces.

It is difficult to foresee who will be the new Ministers chosen by President Carnot, but names have been mentioned recently—those of M. Casimir-Perier and M. Constans. The latter was the Minister who conducted the campaign of 1892, and brought about the final defeat of the Boulangist party.

DEATHS FROM CHOLERA IN RUSSIA.

MANY FATAL CASES KNOWN TO HAVE OCCURRED—INFORMATION WITHHELD BY THE AUTHORITIES.

St. Petersburg, March 30.—Cholera has made its appearance again in this city, and it is known that fatal cases are of daily occurrence, although the authorities have not resumed their policy of making a regular daily announcement of the new cases and deaths, as was done last year. At present the authorities are pursuing a policy of suppression, and withhold from the public all information as to the spread of the disease. Disbelieving rumors have been received from the interior of Russia, and the Ministry of the Interior is taking active steps to suppress the Government must possess special information of the gravest character. The Ministry has ordered the reopening of the medico-sanitary stations in the Volga provinces, where the cholera carried off many thousands last year; and special steamers with sanitary staffs will cruise in the river, stopping along the Volga to pick up any cholera patients or any dead from cholera-stricken vessels plying on that stream. The Government is also causing to be formed sanitary commissions which will take care of the health of the people at the points to be reached through the railway system of Russia.

Washington, March 30.—The cable dispatches announcing cholera in Austria and Russia do not create any alarm in official circles here. No official confirmation of the news has been received, but it is supposed that the Government is prepared for any ordinary emergency that may arise. It already has agents in the principal ports of Europe, whence emigrants depart, and the United States Government has ordered its doctors at all the principal quarantine stations here; and besides all this, the local health authorities are cordially co-operating with the Government in the inspection and quarantine regulations both on the frontiers and seaboard.

MR. GLADSTONE'S MOTION CARRIED.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS TO HAVE PRECEDENCE IN PARLIAMENT AFTER EASTER.

London, March 30.—In the House of Commons this evening Mr. Gladstone made a motion that after Easter the Government business have precedence. Mr. Balfour, leader of the Unionists, said that the motion was calculated to deprive private members of their rights, and would be resisted by the Opposition. It was unprecedented for the Government to claim so early in the session the whole time of the House, and there was nothing so extraordinary in the present situation as to warrant such a proceeding.

Mr. Goschen, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the last Salisbury Cabinet, suggested that Mr. Gladstone's motion be narrowed so as to give precedence to the Government's Irish business.

Sir William Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, replied that the Government could not listen to such a proposal. The motion was made was the least the Government would accept.

William L. Jackson, Chief Secretary for Ireland in the last Cabinet, said that the Government apparently was inaugurating a new policy of compromise. Mr. Balfour, Minister, instead of leading the House, plainly was trying to drive it. The Government had been unable to give one good reason for curtailing the rights of private members, as was proposed in the motion. He therefore would move an amendment that the operation of the motion be limited to the period between Easter and Whit Sunday.

After this amendment had been rejected by a vote of 172 to 59, other amendments were proposed and carried to length, until the Government moved and carried the closure. The vote on Mr. Gladstone's motion was 162 to 75.

COMING REFORMS IN SPAIN.

A LONG-STANDING DEFICIT WIPED OUT—AUTONOMY FOR CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

Madrid, March 30.—The Cabinet Council today drafted the speech from the throne to be read at the opening of the new Cortes. The speech will announce that the long-standing deficit of 70,000,000 pesetas has been abolished through honest and painstaking revision of the estimates and through the opening of new sources of revenue. The policy of retrenchment saves 30,000,000 pesetas, and the remaining 40,000,000 comes from new taxes or the increasing productivity of old taxes.

Legislative councils will be granted to Cuba and Porto Rico. These councils will be composed of local and provincial councils, and men nominated. There shall be a local assembly in each of these islands, and will form virtually the bases of future systems of complete autonomy.

GERMAN TRADERS EXPELLED FROM DAHOMY.

Paris, March 30.—"La Politique Coloniale" publishes a series of decrees issued by General Dodds, commander of the French forces in Dahomey. These decrees order the closing of a warehouse at Wiyah, the Dahoman port, belonging to the firm of Volber & Brohm, of Hamburg, on the ground that Volber & Brohm had been selling arms and ammunition to King Behanzin, who was French. The published decrees also order the expulsion from Dahomey of four German agents named Weyl, Richter, Huss and Barth for furnishing 600 repeating rifles and 200,000 cartridges to Behanzin.

The charge that German traders were supplying the hostile Dahomans with arms and ammunition to fight the French has been frequently and openly denied. The French Government has obtained positive proof to that effect.

THE ARSENAL AT LILLE NEARLY DESTROYED.

Paris, March 30.—The greater part of the arsenal in Lille was burned to-day. All the apparatus used in charging cartridges and melting shells was destroyed. The powder and metallic magazines, however, were saved. Loss, 1,000,000 francs.

DYNAMITE FOUND IN A STEAMER'S HOLD.

Nanaimo, B. C., March 30.—The British steamer Nanaimo has been fighting the salar for some part of last three months. About two months ago part of her crew were kidnapped.

The crew were kidnapped. Three union sailors were arrested, charged with the crime. They were convicted, and are now serving terms in the penitentiary. What is supposed to be a sequel to these troubles is the discovery of an attempt to wreck the Nanaimo with an infernal machine. A sailor who was working in the afterhold of the vessel after her arrival here from San Francisco on Tuesday discovered a package done up in a strange fashion. It was found to contain twelve sticks of dynamite with a clock work attachment. The package was discovered on board the steamer at San Francisco. For some reason the machinery failed to work. Its explosion would have blown the ship's bottom out, and probably there would not have been a soul left to tell how it happened.

It happened. The Coast Seamen's Union is being built for the plot, at least indirectly, as was published in its journal inflammatory articles concerning the kidnapping case. The Provincial Government will take the matter in hand and commence proceedings against the kidnappers, who are being brought the perpetrators of the attempted outrage to justice.

THE SENATE GETS THE DOCUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE DISPUTE.

A SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND CONTAINED IN MANY VOLUME.

Washington, March 30.—The cases and counter-cases of the United States and Great Britain, under the treaty to arbitrate the Behring Sea difficulty between the two countries, were simultaneously sent to the United States Senate to-day, and also made public by transmission to the Houses of Parliament in London.

They comprised altogether fourteen volumes of printed matter, being about equally divided in bulk. The case and counter-case for the United States was prepared by J. W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, assisted by Alex. Porter, Morse, of this city; Mr. Condit, of New-York, and others, and with the argument of counsel and accompanying documents made six volumes. Two of these were portfolios of maps and photographs of the seal rookeries, taken by the United States Commission, which investigated this subject of seal life under the treaty. It also included diplomatic correspondence on the general subject, and the evidence secured by the Behring Sea Seal Commission. The summary of the claims made for the United States is as follows:

That prior to and up to the time of the cession of Alaska to the United States Russia asserted and exercised an exclusive right to the seal fisheries in the waters of Behring Sea, and also asserted and exercised throughout that right to prevent the employment, when necessary, of reasonable force any invasion of such exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

A SALESMAN CHARGED WITH LARCENY.

HE PAWNED THE FIRM'S WATCHES TO ATTEND A REUNION OF THE G. A. R.

William T. Hopkins, fifty-one years old, of Syracuse, was until yesterday a travelling salesman in the employ of S. F. Myers & Co., jewellers, at Nos. 48 and 50 Maiden Lane. Yesterday he pleaded guilty in the Tombs Police Court to a charge of larceny of six watches, valued at \$120. He said he had pawned the watches and appropriated the money to his own use.

Hopkins has been in the service of Myers & Co. for eight years. He has been a successful salesman. He is a Grand Army man, and last year, before the reunion in Washington, he pawned several watches to get money to spend at the celebration. It was for the larceny of these watches that a complaint was made against him yesterday.

He was released upon a charge, and in default of bail, was locked up in the Tombs.

SIX FISHERMEN SUPPOSED TO BE LOST.

Provincetown, Mass., March 30.—The fishing schooner Ada K. Damon arrived this morning with her log at half-mast. Captain Vera reports that on Tuesday he had four deaths with travel set ten miles southeast of Highland Light, when a snow storm set in from the northeast. One dory succeeded in finding the vessel, but the other three, containing six men, could not be found. It is supposed that they were blown to sea until they made land and were captured in the heavy surf and all drowned. Two dories badly stove and a lot of fishing gear were picked up at Nauset station on Saturday, also one dory, three tubs and a trawl and one body at Wellfleet station. The body answers the description of Robert Woody, unmarried, a native of Cape Verde Islands, one of the crew of the Damon. The other missing men are Joseph Farrell, unmarried, of Provincetown, formerly master of the schooner Edith; McIntyre; James Tracy, of Provincetown; a wife; Michael, Western Islands; Joseph Rose, unmarried, of Provincetown, and one unknown. Portuguese, said to be married, leaving a family in Western Islands.

THE STEAMER HANDBROCK RELEASED.

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., March 30.—After lying imbedded in the mud for nearly a week on the flats near New-Hamburg, the steamer John H. Handbrock was safely released at 10:30 o'clock this morning. The boat was not injured in the past, and it proceeded to sea without any serious slight repairs will be made to her boiler work.

SENT TO THE SUPREME COURT FOR REVIEW.

Trenton, N. J., March 30.—The Camden Law and Order League today obtained from Chief Justice Boasler a writ of certiorari removing to the Supreme Court the license granted to the Gloucester race-track by the Gloucester City Council for review.

PENNSYLVANIA CRIMINALS PAROLED.

Harrisburg, Penn., March 30.—The Board of Pardons has recommended pardons for "Abie" Buzzard, the notorious Wolf Mountain outlaw, and James S. Dunlap, the wrecker of the Bank of America, Philadelphia, and Governor Pattison signed them today.

CAPTAIN HENRY'S MISSION IN BRAZIL.

Cleveland, March 30.—It is learned to-night that Captain C. E. Henry went to Brazil to arrest H. A. Bolsoford, who embezzled \$200,000 from the Woods Jeans Company, of this city, and I have heard anything about it. Fugitive nobody here has heard anything about it.

THE BOTTLE STORY A NOVEL.

Messages in sealed bottles, revelations of spiritualists and mind readers, homing pigeons and the draining of marine theorists have all failed to reveal any traces of the lost steamer Narbonne. It is now definitely known that the homing pigeons bearing the letters "N" and figures upon their leg bands, which have been found along the coast, were released from lots in Philadelphia. The letter "N" stood for the name of the society by which the birds are owned. A bottle was picked up upon the Virginia coast on Tuesday containing a message purporting to be from John Olson, a cattleman on the Narbonne. There never was a man by the name of Olson, and the message was a hoax. The wrecked Narbonne could not have been carried to the point on the Virginia coast where the alleged message from the Narbonne was received. The bottle story is a hoax.

LIVERPOOL, March 30.—The official of the White Star Steamship Company regard as a hoax the message found in a bottle on the beach at Ocean View, Va., and purporting to give an account of the destruction at sea of the White Star steamship Narbonne, which sailed from Liverpool on February 11 for New-York.

John Olson, cattleman, appended to the letter in the bottle, that there was no person named Olson on board the Narbonne, and the bottle story is a hoax. It was improbable that a bottle thrown from the wrecked Narbonne, where she would have been at the time of the accident described in the letter, would have drifted against the Gulf Stream to the place where this bottle was found.

SHE SAYS THE COSSACKS WERE NOT SEASICK.

Those Cossacks who came over in the American line steamer Chester to join the Adam Poughkeepsie show were not sick. Not a bit of it. There was a visible in the eyes of Princess Dimitri, the leader of the rugged children of the Russian frontier, when she said yesterday that her subjects were accustomed to travel, but that they would have preferred to have ridden to America, even if it had taken them four months longer. Then she shrugged her shoulders and said that the ocean was a hard road to travel. A charming and handsome, and presents a striking figure in tall patent leather boots and laced-up garments. She speaks English, French and Russian. She has travelled all over Europe, and she can talk interestingly upon what she has seen and heard. The men of her party are tall and handsome. The party are expert horsemen. The greater part of their lives has been spent upon horseback. The Cossacks are at the Astor House. Their horses will reach this port in a few days.

BEHRING SEA CASES SENT IN.

THE SENATE GETS THE DOCUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE DISPUTE.

A SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND CONTAINED IN MANY VOLUME.

Washington, March 30.—The cases and counter-cases of the United States and Great Britain, under the treaty to arbitrate the Behring Sea difficulty between the two countries, were simultaneously sent to the United States Senate to-day, and also made public by transmission to the Houses of Parliament in London.

They comprised altogether fourteen volumes of printed matter, being about equally divided in bulk. The case and counter-case for the United States was prepared by J. W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, assisted by Alex. Porter, Morse, of this city; Mr. Condit, of New-York, and others, and with the argument of counsel and accompanying documents made six volumes. Two of these were portfolios of maps and photographs of the seal rookeries, taken by the United States Commission, which investigated this subject of seal life under the treaty. It also included diplomatic correspondence on the general subject, and the evidence secured by the Behring Sea Seal Commission. The summary of the claims made for the United States is as follows:

That prior to and up to the time of the cession of Alaska to the United States Russia asserted and exercised an exclusive right to the seal fisheries in the waters of Behring Sea, and also asserted and exercised throughout that right to prevent the employment, when necessary, of reasonable force any invasion of such exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights.

That the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same exclusive rights, and that the United States, upon the cession of Alaska, asserted and exercised the same